



Towards bankable lidars - how stable are lidars over time?

Nygaard, Nicolai Gayle; Diznabi, Babak; Stein, Detlef; Courtney, Michael

Publication date:
2013

[Link back to DTU Orbit](#)

Citation (APA):

Nygaard, N. G. (Author), Diznabi, B. (Author), Stein, D. (Author), & Courtney, M. (Author). (2013). Towards bankable lidars - how stable are lidars over time?. Sound/Visual production (digital), European Wind Energy Association (EWEA). <http://www.ewea.org/annual2013/>

General rights

Copyright and moral rights for the publications made accessible in the public portal are retained by the authors and/or other copyright owners and it is a condition of accessing publications that users recognise and abide by the legal requirements associated with these rights.

- Users may download and print one copy of any publication from the public portal for the purpose of private study or research.
- You may not further distribute the material or use it for any profit-making activity or commercial gain
- You may freely distribute the URL identifying the publication in the public portal

If you believe that this document breaches copyright please contact us providing details, and we will remove access to the work immediately and investigate your claim.

TOWARDS BANKABLE LIDARS

- HOW STABLE ARE LIDARS OVER TIME?

BY

Nicolai Gayle Nygaard and Babak Diznabi: DONG Energy

Detlef Stein: GL-Garrad Hassan

Mike Courtney: DTU Wind Energy - mike@dtu.dk



Overview

- What is needed for bankability
- What is temporal uncertainty
- Comparing old and new calibrations
- Assessing our repeatability
- Can we do better?
- Conclusions and outlook



What is needed for bankability?

We see four fundamental elements to reach bankability of lidars in wind resource assessment:

- **Accredited lidar calibration.** (DTU DANAK) 
- **Best practices.** (IEA Recommended Practices coming soon) 
- **Understanding of temporal uncertainty.**
 - Not really investigated yet
- **Understanding of site sensitivity.**
 - The draft IEC 61400-12-1 Annex L includes lidar classification to tackle this as one approach
 - More fundamental understanding is another, complementary approach

What is the aim of this project?

- **Accredited lidar calibration.** (DTU DANAK)
- **Best practices.** (IEA Recommended Practices coming soon)
- **Understanding of temporal uncertainty.**
 - Not really investigated yet
- **Understanding of site sensitivity.**
 - The draft IEC 61400-12-1 Annex L includes lidar classification to tackle this as one approach
 - More fundamental understanding is another, complementary approach

What is this presentation about?


- Accredited lidar calibration. (DTU DANAK)
- Best practices. (IEA Recommended Practices coming soon)
- **Understanding of temporal uncertainty.**
 - Not really investigated yet
- **Understanding of site sensitivity.**
 - The draft IEC 61400-12-1 Annex L includes lidar classification to tackle this as one approach
 - More fundamental understanding is another, complementary approach

Temporal uncertainty – our plan

- Temporal uncertainty = Do lidars drift?

To answer this question we will:

1. Look at a number of old calibration results and compare with more recent results
2. Run 2 calibrated lidars offshore for a year each and then post calibrate them.




Lidars on FINO2




Our method

- Study lidar calibrations made for 6 different lidars before and after field operation
- All were pulsed lidars, most “first generation”
- Time in field varies between 390 and 900 days
- 2 were offshore deployments, 4 were onshore




What is a lidar calibration?

116m





...

60m




40m



Things to be careful about


- Avoid changes in the calibration procedure (data analysis)
 - Use the same procedure for the old and new calibrations
 - Use the accredited DTU DANAK procedure
- Cup anemometer calibrations



Results

The simplest result is for the 'forced' linear regression $U_{\text{lidar}} = M \cdot U_{\text{cup}}$


We can compare values of M obtained for the different calibrations. In the plot there are 6 lidars x 5 heights = 30 different data pairs.



Grouping gain differences

Height

Gain difference vs height




Other possibilities

- Start date
- Duration
- Mean speed
- Mean direction
- Mean shear
- Mean turbulence intensity
-

Individual lidar

Gain difference vs lidar number



What does this tell us?

- Gain is reasonably well correlated between the two calibrations.

But



- There is also quite significant variation.
- Are these differences real changes in the lidar characteristics?

Or


- Can they be at least partly explained by the 'natural variation' in calibration results?
- What we really need to assess is the **repeatability** of our lidar calibrations

One lidar in one place – how much can the calibration change?


The sliding window technique



How much the calibration can change just by starting in a different month?




Most of the scatter between the first and second calibrations can be explained by this limited repeatability.



Reasons for the poor repeatability -1

- Shear effects on the regression results
 - Sensing height errors are consistently reported between the initial and post calibrations and can explain some of the calibration variability.



Reasons for the poor repeatability - 2

- Shear effects on the regression results
 - Need more rigorous analysis of sensing height error and correction for this in the data (or a modified procedure)
- Turbulence effects on the regression results
 - Can be reduced by using and comparing vector means instead of scalar means
- Mast effects on the regression results
 - More careful attention needed here
- Lidar performance changes ? ?

Conclusions and outlook

- There is quite good correlation between old and new lidar calibration results with most differences contained within the limits of the repeatability.
- There is no evidence of significant long term drift.
- Calibration repeatability needs to be improved by better understanding of the shear and turbulence effects.
- This improved understanding will also reduce the differences in lidar performance between different sites. This will further decrease the uncertainties in lidar wind speed measurements.
- We are working on these issues in the Bankable Lidar project and also under the IEA Annex32.

Acknowledgments to my co-authors



DONG
energy

GL
GL Garrad Hassan